



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,023	09/14/2000	Mi Young Kim	0630-11550P	9860
7590	12/23/2004		EXAMINER	
Birch Stewart Kalasch & Birch LLP P O Box 747 Falls Church, VA 22040-0747			PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2653	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/662,023	KIM, MI YOUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Aristotelis M Psitos	2653	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see next page..

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see next page.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: see attached page.

*11. Attached 892*

Aristotelis M Psitos  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2653



Note 2 a continued: With respect to the newly proposed amendments to the claims, this alters the scope of the invention previously examined and searched. Such an alteration requires more than a cursory review of the record and inherently a new search. Under present USPTO practice, such is not performed at the present time juncture. If applicant is desirous of such a scope of protection, then the examiner strongly recommends the filing of a RCE.

with respect to the submitted arguments, since they focus upon unentered limitations, they are not persuasive to overcome the rejection as presented in the FR.

With respect to applicants' representatives request for a) relief due to the alleged prematurity of the finality of the previous OA, the examiner is not persuaded. Contrary to applicant's arguments the amendments to the claims altered the scope of the invention previously recited and necessitated the new grounds of rejection. While it is true the amendments clarified 112 issues, the examiner could not prophesize how applicant intended to amend the claims to overcome the 112 rejections.

#### ERRATA

With respect to applicant's request for a 1-month extension of time due to the failure of the previous OA from listing the Tonegawa reference. The examiner does not agree, since applicant has responded to the outstanding OA during the time period set in the last OA and has responded to all outstanding issues by proposing amendments to the claims. The examiner interprets the noted MPEP section as relief to applicants requiring additional time to respond. Since applicant has responded, the relief requested is moot.